arXiv:1609.02483v1 [math.QA] 8 Sep 2016

Quantum exceptional group G_2 and its conjugacy classes

Alexander Baranov†, Andrey Mudrov†,*, and Vadim Ostapenko‡

Dedicated to the memory of Petr Kulish

† Department of Mathematics,
University of Leicester,
University Road, LE1 7RH Leicester, UK

‡ Department of Mathematics,
Bar Ilan University,
Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel.

Abstract

We construct quantization of semisimple conjugacy classes of the exceptional group $G = G_2$ along with and by means of their exact representations in highest weight modules of the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. With every point t of a fixed maximal torus we associate a highest weight module M_t over $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and realize the quantized polynomial algebra of the class of t by linear operators on M_t. Quantizations corresponding to points of the same orbit of the Weyl group are isomorphic.

Mathematics Subject Classifications: 81R50, 81R60, 17B37.
Key words: Quantum groups, conjugacy classes, quantization

*This study is supported in part by the RFBR grant 15-01-03148.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Semisimple conjugacy classes of G_2 **4**

3 Quantized universal enveloping algebra **7**

3.1 Minimal representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ 8

4 Quantum conjugacy classes **9**

5 Generalized parabolic Verma modules **11**

5.1 Standard filtration of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ 12

6 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ **14**

6.1 Singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$ 14

6.2 Projection to gr $\mathcal{V}_\bullet$ 15

6.3 Regularization of singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$ 16

6.4 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ 17

7 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_s}$ **18**

7.1 Regularization of singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ 19

7.2 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_s}$ 20

8 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$ **20**

8.1 Regularization of singular vectors for quasi-Levi $\mathfrak{k}$ 20

8.2 Regularization of singular vectors for Levi $\mathfrak{k}$ 21

8.3 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$ 22

9 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for pseudo-Levi $\mathfrak{k}$ **22**

A Appendix **24**

A.1 Formulas for η_{ij} and ξ_{ij} 24

A.2 Entries of the matrix F 24

1 Introduction

Exceptional Lie groups occupy a special position in mathematics among simple groups and find important applications in theoretical physics in connection with string theories, supergravity, and grand unification, [1, 2]. At the same time their quantum analogs are the least studied compared to other quantum groups. In the this paper we focus on the simplest exceptional group $G = G_2$ and construct quantization of its semisimple conjugacy classes via operator algebra realization.

To this end, we undertake a thorough analysis of certain modules over the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of G. In particular, we associate such module, M_λ, with every point t of a fixed maximal torus of G and prove that the polynomial algebra of the class $O_t \ni t$ can be quantized as a subalgebra in $\mathrm{End}(M_\lambda)$. Here λ is the highest weight of M_λ, that depends on t. The quantum polynomial algebra is simultaneously presented as a quotient of the locally finite part $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ of the adjoint module $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by the explicitly given ideal annihilating M_λ.

The quantization is facilitated by the properties of the matrix $\mathcal{Q} \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ expressed through the universal R-matrix $\mathcal{R}$ as $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R}$. It is known to commute with the coproduct $\Delta(x)$ of all elements $x \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and satisfy the reflection equation [3]. On specialization of the left tensor factor to the minimal representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on $V = \mathbb{C}^7$, the entries of matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ generate $\mathbb{C}_q[G] \subset U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Quantization is possible due to semisimplicity of the operator $\mathcal{Q}$ on $V \otimes M_\lambda$, which is a consequence of direct sum decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ into a sum of submodules of highest weight. It may be interpreted as quantization of the basic quantum homogeneous vector bundles over O_t. We give exact criteria for such decomposition for each module M_λ, which required a detailed study of singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$.

The setup of the paper is a follows. Section 2 presents a classification of semisimple conjugacy classes of G_2 adopted to our purposes. It is followed by the basic information about the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and its minimal representation on $\mathbb{C}^7$ in Section 3. The quantization theorem based on decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ is stated in Section 3. The subsequent sections prove this decomposition for each type of M_λ. In Section 5 we define generalized parabolic Verma modules and establish some their properties. We do regularization of singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$ for a general Verma module M_λ, in Section 6. The last three sections are devoted to regularization of singular vectors in tensor products and direct sum decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ for all other types of M_λ. Some useful formulas including the entries of matrix participating in the Shapovalov inverse form can be found in Appendix.

Throughout the paper we adopt the following general convention:

- For better readability of formulas, we denote a scalar inverse by the bar, e.g. $\bar{q} = q^{-1}$.
- The notation $a \simeq b$ means that a is proportional to b with a non-zero scalar factor. If the coefficient is a scalar function, we thereby assume that it never turns zero. The symbol $\simeq$ also stands for isomorphism, which is always clear from the context and causes no confusion.
- Divisibility by a regular scalar function ϕ is denoted by $\phi \sqsubset$.

2 Semisimple conjugacy classes of G_2

In this section we describe semisimple conjugacy classes of the complex algebraic group $G = G_2$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ denote the Lie algebra of G and with a fixed Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. Its root system R is displayed on the figure below.



The subset of positive roots $\mathrm{R}^+ \subset \mathrm{R}$ contains the basis of simple roots $\Pi = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Fix an inner product on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ as

$$(\alpha, \alpha) = 2, \quad (\alpha, \beta) = -3, \quad (\beta, \beta) = 6.$$

The half-sum of positive roots $5\alpha + 3\beta$ is denoted by ρ.

To all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we assign its image h_λ under the isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}^* \simeq \mathfrak{h}$ via the canonical form: $\mu(h_\lambda) = (\lambda, \mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

The group G has an exact representation in $\mathbb{C}^7$. The corresponding representation of the quantum group is given in Section 3.1.

The affine Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}$ suggests the following stabilizers $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ of semisimple conjugacy classes labelled by the their root bases $\Pi_\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathrm{R}^+_\mathfrak{g}$:

$\mathfrak{k}$	$\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}}$		
$\mathfrak{h}$	$\varnothing$		
$\mathfrak{k}_s$	$\{\alpha\}$,	$\{\alpha+\beta\}$,	$\{2\alpha+\beta\}$
$\mathfrak{k}_l$	$\{\beta\}$,	$\{3\alpha+\beta\}$,	$\{3\alpha+2\beta\}$
$\mathfrak{k}_{s,l}$	$\{\alpha, 3\alpha+2\beta\}$,	$\{\alpha+\beta, 3\alpha+\beta\}$,	$\{2\alpha+\beta, \beta\}$
$\mathfrak{k}_{l,l}$	$\{\beta, 3\alpha+2\beta\}$		

The subscripts indicate the lengths of roots. There are three Levi types with $\#\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}} \leqslant 1$ and two pseudo-Levi types with $\#\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}} = 2$.

Different although isomorphic $\mathfrak{k}$ give rise to the same conjugacy class G/K, where K is the subgroup with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$. Still we make this distinction because we associate with them different representations of quantized G/K.

Let T denote the maximal torus of G corresponding to $\mathfrak{h}$ and fix $t \in T$ such that $\mathfrak{k}$ is the centralizer of t. We parameterize T with a pair of complex coordinates $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^\star$. In the matrix realization that gives

$$t = \mathrm{diag}(xy, x, y, 1, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{x}\bar{y}) \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^7).$$

Regarding the roots as characters on T, we have $\alpha(t) = y$, $\beta(t) = xy^{-1}$.

Define $T^{\mathfrak{k}} \subset T$ as the subset of points whose centralizer Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{k}$. We will also use the notation $T^{\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}}} = T^{\mathfrak{k}}$. We select the subset $T^{\mathfrak{k}}_{reg} \in T^{\mathfrak{k}}$ of regular points, whose minimal polynomial in the basic representation has maximal degree. The complementary subset in $T^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is denoted by $T^{\mathfrak{k}}_{bord}$ and called borderline, following [4]. Such points are present only for $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_l$. They are a sort of "transitional" from Levi to pseudo-Levi type, hence the name.

The set $T^{\varnothing} = T^{\mathfrak{h}}$ is determined by the conditions $x \neq 1$, $y \neq 1$, $x \neq y$, $xy^2 \neq 1$, $x^2y \neq 1$, $xy \neq 1$. It is convenient to use the first three diagonal matrix entries for description of t:

$$T^{\varnothing}_{reg} : (xy, x, y), \quad x \neq y, \quad x^i y^j \neq 1, \quad i, j = 0, 1, 2; \tag{2.1}$$

$$T^{\varnothing}_{bord} : (-x, -1, x), \quad (-x, x, -1), \quad (-1, x, -\bar{x}), \quad x^4 \neq 1; \tag{2.2}$$

$$T^{\alpha} : (x, x, 1), \quad T^{\alpha+\beta} : (x, 1, x), \quad T^{2\alpha+\beta} : (1, x, x^{-1}), \quad x^2 \neq 1; \tag{2.3}$$

$$T^{\beta}_{reg} : (x^2, x, x), \quad T^{3\alpha+\beta}_{reg} : (\bar{x}, \bar{x}^2, x), \quad T^{3\alpha+2\beta}_{reg} : (\bar{x}, x, \bar{x}^2), \quad x^3, x^4 \neq 1; \tag{2.4}$$

$$T^{\beta}_{bord} : (-1, x, x), \quad T^{3\alpha+\beta}_{bord} : (\bar{x}, -1, x), \quad T^{3\alpha+2\beta}_{bord} : (\bar{x}, x, -1), \quad x = e^{\pm\frac{\pi i}{2}}; \tag{2.5}$$

$$T^{\alpha,3\alpha+2\beta} : (-1, -1, 1), \quad T^{\alpha+\beta,3\alpha+\beta} : (-1, 1, -1), \quad T^{2\alpha+\beta,\beta} : (1, -1, -1); \tag{2.6}$$

$$T^{\beta,3\alpha+\beta} : (\bar{x}, x, x), \quad x = e^{\pm\frac{2\pi i}{3}}. \tag{2.7}$$

We have listed all possible $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, so that the sets

$$T^s = T^\alpha \cup T^{\alpha+\beta} \cup T^{2\alpha+\beta}, \quad T^l = T^\beta \cup T^{3\alpha+\beta} \cup T^{3\alpha+2\beta},$$

$$T^{s,l} = T^{\alpha,3\alpha+2\beta} \cup T^{\alpha+\beta,3\alpha+\beta} \cup T^{2\alpha+\beta,\beta}, \quad T^{l,l} = T^{\beta,3\alpha+\beta},$$

along with $T^\varnothing$ exhaust all of T. They consist of points whose conjugacy classes are isomorphic as homogeneous spaces.

Denote by $\tilde{G}$ the group $SL(7)$ and by $\tilde{W}$ its Weyl group. The Weyl group of G is denoted by W. It is elementary fact that the intersection of $\tilde{G}$-conjugacy class with G consists of a finite number of G-classes.

Proposition 2.1. *The conjugacy class of each semisimple point $t \in G$ is the intersection of its $\tilde{G}$-conjugacy class with G.*

Proof. A semisimple conjugacy class of $\tilde{G}$ is determined by the set of eigenvalues and their multiplicities. It is sufficient to check that $\tilde{W}t \cap T = Wt$ for all $t \in T$.

Fix $t = (xy, x, y) \in T^\varnothing$ so that $y \neq -1$. One can assume that the multiplicity of y is 1, since otherwise $x \neq -1$ and one can flip $x \to y$ by σ_β. Present $\tilde{W}t \cap T$ as a union $Y \cup \bar{Y}$ of sets whose elements have either y or $\bar{y}$ among their first three coordinates. It is disjoint for $t \in T^\varnothing$.

One can check that $\#|Y| = \#|\bar{Y}| = 6$. Then $Y \subset Wt$ since

$$(xy, x, y) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (xy, y, x) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (y, xy, \bar{x}) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (y, \bar{x}, xy) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (\bar{x}, y, \bar{x}\bar{y}) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (\bar{x}, \bar{x}\bar{y}, y).$$

The set $\bar{Y}$ is obtained from Y by inverting the coordinates. One has $\bar{Y} \subset Wt$ as $Y \ni (xy, x, y) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (x, xy, \bar{y}) \in \bar{Y}$.

Further,

$$T^s \ni (x, 1, x) \overset{\sigma_{2\alpha+\beta}}{\sim} (\bar{x}, \bar{x}, 1) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (\bar{x}, 1, \bar{x}) \overset{\sigma_{2\alpha+\beta}}{\sim} (x, x, 1) \overset{\sigma_{\alpha+\beta}}{\sim} (1, \bar{x}, x) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (1, x, \bar{x}), \quad x^2 \neq 1,$$

$$T^l \ni (\bar{x}, x, \bar{x}^2) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (\bar{x}, \bar{x}^2, x) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (\bar{x}^2, \bar{x}, \bar{x}) \overset{\sigma_{\beta+2\alpha}}{\sim} (x^2, x, x) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (x, x^2, \bar{x}) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (x, \bar{x}, x^2), \quad x^2, x^3 \neq 1,$$

$$T^{l,s} \ni (1, -1, -1) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (-1, 1, -1) \overset{\sigma_\beta}{\sim} (-1, -1, 1),$$

$$T^{l,l} \ni (e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}) \overset{\sigma_\alpha}{\sim} (e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}).$$

This proves $\tilde{W}t = Wt$ for all $t \in T$. □

Corollary 2.2. *The ideal of a semisimple conjugacy class in $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is generated by the entries of the minimal polynomial over the maximal ideal of the subalgebra of invariants.*

Proof. Fix a semisimple point $t \in G$ and consider its conjugacy classes $\tilde{O}_t \subset \tilde{G}$ and $O_t \subset G$. Let F_1 and F_2 be G-submodules in $\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^7)$ generating the ideals $N(\tilde{O}_t)$ and $N(\tilde{G})$, respectively. Put $f_i \colon \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{C}^7) \to F_i$ be the corresponding maps and set $f = f_1 \oplus f_2$. By construction, f is G-equivariant. It is sufficient to prove that $\ker df(t) = \ker df_1(t) \cap \ker df_2(t)$ has the same dimension as O_t, cf. [5], Prop. 2.1. For the general linear group, $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_t = \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \ominus \tilde{\mathfrak{k}} = \ker df_1(t)$, and $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_t = \mathrm{Ad}_t(\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_t)$. On the other hand, $\ker df_2(t) = \mathrm{Ad}_t(\mathfrak{g})$, and $\ker df = \ker df_1 \cap \ker df_2 = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_t \cap \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g} \ominus \mathfrak{k}$ since $t \in G$. This completes the proof. □

Recall from linear algebra that a semisimple $\tilde{G}$-class is determined by the set of eigenvalues and their multiplicities. Eigenvalues are fixed by the minimal polynomial while the multiplicities by the character of the subalgebra of invariants under conjugation. The subalgebra of invariants when restricted to maximal torus $\tilde{T} \subset \tilde{G}$ is generated by the functions $t \mapsto \mathrm{Tr}(t^m)$, $m \in 1, \dots, 7$, and the character is evaluation at t. The possible minimal polynomials of $t \in T$ are listed here:

$$(t - xy)(t - x)(t - y)(t - 1)(t - \bar{x})(t - \bar{y})(t - \bar{x}\bar{y}), \quad t \in T^{\varnothing}_{reg}, \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2_{reg},$$

$$(t^2 - x^2)(t^2 - 1)(t^2 - \bar{x}^2), \quad t \in T^{\varnothing}_{bord}, \quad x^4 \neq 1, \quad \mathrm{mlt}(-1) = 2,$$

$$(t - x)(t - 1)(t - \bar{x}), \quad t \in T^{s}, \quad x^2 \neq 1, \qquad \mathrm{mlt}(x^{\pm 1}) = 2,$$

$$(t - x^2)(t - x)(t - 1)(t - \bar{x})(t - \bar{x}^2), \quad t \in T^{l}_{reg}, \quad x^3 \neq 1 \neq x^4, \quad \mathrm{mlt}(x^{\pm 1}) = 2,$$

$$(t^4 - 1), \quad t \in T^{s}_{bord}, \quad \mathrm{mlt}(-1) = \mathrm{mlt}(\pm i) = 2,$$

$$(t^2 - 1), \quad t \in T^{s,l}, \quad \mathrm{mlt}(-1) = 4,$$

$$(t^3 - 1), \quad t \in T^{l,l}, \quad \mathrm{mlt}(e^{\pm \frac{2\pi i}{3}}) = 3.$$

Remark that regular points, contrary to borderline, separate irreducible $\mathfrak{k}$-submodules in $\mathbb{C}^7$. The two bottom lines correspond to the two pseudo-Levi classes.

3 Quantized universal enveloping algebra

Throughout the paper we assume that $q \in \mathbb{C}$ is not a root of unity. Denote by $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_\pm)$ the $\mathbb{C}$-algebra generated by $e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta}$ subject to the q-Serre relations

$$e^4_{\pm\alpha} e_{\pm\beta} - [4]_q e^3_{\pm\alpha} e_{\pm\beta} e_{\pm\alpha} + [3]_q (q^2 + q^{-2}) e^2_{\pm\alpha} e_{\pm\beta} e^2_{\pm\alpha} - [4]_q e_{\pm\alpha} e_{\pm\beta} e^3_{\pm\alpha} + e_{\pm\beta} e^4_{\pm\alpha} = 0,$$

$$e^2_{\pm\beta} e_{\pm\alpha} - (q^3 + q^{-3}) e_{\pm\beta} e_{\pm\alpha} e_{\pm\beta} + e_{\pm\alpha} e^2_{\pm\beta} = 0.$$

Here and further on, $[z]_q = \frac{q^z - q^{-z}}{q - q^{-1}}$ whenever $q^{\pm z}$ make sense.

Denote by $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ the commutative $\mathbb{C}$-algebra generated by $\{q^{\pm h_\alpha}\}_{\alpha\in\Pi}$, with $q^{h_\alpha}q^{-h_\alpha} = 1$. The quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra generated by $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_\pm)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ subject to the relations [6]:

$$q^{h_\alpha}e_{\pm\alpha}q^{h_\alpha} = q^{\pm 2}e_{\pm\alpha}, \quad q^{h_\alpha}e_{\pm\beta}q^{-h_\alpha} = q^{\mp 3}e_{\pm\beta},$$
$$q^{h_\beta}e_{\pm\alpha}q^{-h_\beta} = q^{\mp 3}e_{\pm\alpha}, \quad q^{h_\beta}e_{\pm\beta}q^{-h_\beta} = q^{\pm 6}e_{\pm\alpha},$$
$$[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = \frac{q^{h_\alpha} - q^{-h_\alpha}}{q - q^{-1}}, \quad [e_\beta, e_{-\beta}] = \frac{q^{h_\beta} - q^{-h_\beta}}{q^3 - q^{-3}}.$$

Remark that the vector space $\mathfrak{h}$ is not contained in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, still it is convenient to keep reference to $\mathfrak{h}$ for additive parametrization of monomials in $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$.

Set up the comultiplication on the generators as

$$\Delta(e_\alpha) = e_\alpha \otimes 1 + q^{h_\alpha} \otimes e_\alpha, \quad \Delta(e_{-\alpha}) = 1 \otimes e_{-\alpha} + e_{-\alpha} \otimes q^{-h_\alpha},$$
$$\Delta(q^{\pm h_\alpha}) = q^{\pm h_\alpha} \otimes q^{\pm h_\alpha},$$

for all $\alpha \in \Pi$. It is opposite to that in [7].

We will use the notation $f_\alpha = e_{-\alpha}$, $f_\beta = [3]_q e_{-\beta}$, so the only relation that is inhomogeneous in $e_{-\alpha}$ translates to $[e_\beta, f_\beta] = \frac{q^{h_\beta} - q^{-h_\beta}}{q - q^{-1}}$.

The subalgebras in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_\pm)$ over $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ are quantized universal enveloping algebras of the Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{b}_\pm = \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}_\pm \subset \mathfrak{g}$ denoted further by $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_\pm)$.

The Chevalley generators $e_{\pm\alpha}$ can be supplemented with higher root vectors $e_{\pm\beta}$ for all $\beta \in \mathrm{R}^+$. They participate in construction of a Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt (PBW) basis in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and universal $\mathcal{R}$-matrix, [7].

The universal R-matrix is an element of a certain extension of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^2$ be an orthogonal basis in $\mathfrak{h}^*$. The exact expression for $\mathcal{R}$ up to the flip is extracted from [7], Theorem 8.3.9:

$$\mathcal{R} = q^{\sum_{i=1}^2 h_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes h_{\varepsilon_i}} \prod_{\mu\in\mathrm{R}^+} \exp_{q_\mu}(1 - q_\mu^{-2})(e_{-\mu} \otimes e_\mu) \in U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)\hat{\otimes}U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\exp_q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty q^{\frac{1}{2}k(k+1)}\frac{x^k}{[k]_q}$, $q_\mu = q^{\frac{(\mu,\mu)}{2}}$, and the product is ordered in a certain way. Its reduction to the minimal representation can be found in [8, 9].

3.1 Minimal representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$

In this section we describe a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in the vector space $\mathbb{C}^7$. It is a deformation of the classical representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ restricted from $\mathfrak{so}(7)$. Our realization is close to [10].

Let I denote the set of integers from $1, \dots, 7$. Fix a basis $\{w_i\}_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{C}^7 = V$ and let $e_{ij} \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ denote the standard matrix units, $e_{ij}w_k = \delta_{jk}w_i$, $i, j, k \in I$. One can check that the assignment

$$\begin{aligned} q^{h_\alpha} &\mapsto qe_{11} + q^{-1}e_{22} + q^2e_{33} + e_{44} + q^{-2}e_{55} + qe_{66} + q^{-1}e_{77}, \\ q^{h_\beta} &\mapsto e_{11} + q^3e_{22} + q^{-3}e_{33} + e_{44} + q^3e_{55} + q^{-3}e_{66} + e_{77}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_\alpha &\mapsto e_{12} + e_{34} + e_{45} + e_{67}, \quad & f_\alpha &\mapsto e_{21} + [2]_q e_{43} + [2]_q e_{54} + e_{76}, \\ e_\beta &\mapsto e_{23} + e_{56}, & f_\beta &\mapsto e_{32} + e_{65}. \end{aligned}$$

is compatible with the defining relations and extends to a homomorphism $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \to \mathrm{End}(V)$.

Up to scalar multiplies, the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ can be depicted by the graph by



The representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_+)$ is obtained by reversing the arrows. Let $\nu_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ denote the weight of w_i, then

$$\nu_1 = 2\alpha + \beta, \quad \nu_2 = \alpha + \beta, \quad \nu_3 = \alpha, \quad \nu_4 = 0, \quad \nu_5 = -\alpha, \quad \nu_6 = -\alpha - \beta, \quad \nu_7 = -2\alpha - \beta.$$

For all $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}\Pi$ we denote by $P(\nu)$ the set of pairs $(i, j) \in I \times I$ such that $\nu_i - \nu_j = \nu$. For each pair with $i < j$ there is a unique element $\psi \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ such that $w_j = \psi w_i$. In fact, it is a monomial in f_α, f_β. Let $\psi^{ij} \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ be the monomial obtained from it by reversing the order of factors.

4 Quantum conjugacy classes

In this section we describe quantum semisimple conjugacy classes along the lines of [11] and [13]. The construction is based on certain facts from representation theory to be established in the subsequent sections.

We regard elements of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ as characters of T and elements of T as spectral points of $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ via the correspondence the correspondence $t\colon q^{h_\alpha} \mapsto \alpha(t)$, for all $t \in T$. Fix $t \in T$ and its stabilizer subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}$. Choose the weight λ from the condition $q^{2\lambda} = tq^{2\rho_\mathfrak{k} - 2\rho} = t_q$ regarded as an equality in T upon the identification $\mathfrak{h} \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*$ via the inner product. Consider a 1-dimensional representation $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_+)$ extending $t_q\colon U_q(\mathfrak{h}) \to \mathbb{C}$: it is implemented

by the assignment $q^{\pm h_\alpha} \mapsto q^{\pm(\lambda,\alpha)}$, $e_\alpha \mapsto 0$. Let $M_\lambda = U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}_+)} \mathbb{C}_\lambda$ denote the Verma $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module of highest weight λ with the canonical generator $v_\lambda \in M_\lambda$.

Due to the special choice of λ, it satisfies the conditions $q^{2(\lambda+\rho,\alpha)} = q^{(\alpha,\alpha)}$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi_\mathfrak{k}$, and we denote by $\Theta^\mathfrak{k}$ the set of all such weights. There exist singular vectors $v_{\lambda-\alpha} \in M_\lambda$ annihilated by e_α, $\forall \alpha \in \Pi$. Up to a scalar multiplier, they can be written explicitly as $\hat{f}_{1i} v_\lambda$ with $(1,i) \in P(\alpha)$, where $\hat{f}_{ij}$ are matrix elements of the (reduced) Shapovalov inverse. The vectors $v_{\lambda-\alpha}$ generate submodules $M_{\lambda-\alpha} \subset M_\lambda$. Let $M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$ denote the quotient module $M_\lambda / \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi_\mathfrak{k}} M_{\lambda-\alpha}$. On transition to the $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-extension via $q = e^\hbar$, $M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$ is free over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$, by Lemma 5.2.

Denote by $\mathcal{Q} = (\pi \otimes \mathrm{id})(\mathcal{R}_{21}\mathcal{R}) \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ a matrix with entries in the quantum group. It commutes with the coproduct of all elements from $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and plays a key role in the theory. Its entries generate a subalgebra $\mathbb{C}_q[G] \subset U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, which is an equivariant quantization of $\mathbb{C}[G]$. So $\mathcal{Q}$ is the matrix of "coordinate" functions on G. It satisfies the so called "reflection equation" rather then the RTT-relations of the Hopf dual to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

The operator $\mathcal{Q}$ is scalar on every submodule of highest weight in $V \otimes M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$ as well as a quotient module. Its eigenvalues can be described as follows. In the classical limit, the module V is completely reducible over $\mathfrak{k}$. Let $I^\mathfrak{k} \subset I$ denote the subset of indices of $\mathfrak{k}$-highest vectors w_i. Then the eigenvalues are $x_j = q^{2(\lambda+\rho,\nu_j)+(\nu_j,\nu_j)-(\nu_1,\nu_1)+2(\rho,\nu_1)}$. It is proved in the subsequent sections that $\mathcal{Q}$ is semisimple on $V \otimes M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$, so its minimal polynomial is

$$\prod_{j\in I^\mathfrak{k}}{}' (\mathcal{Q} - x_j) = 0, \tag{4.9}$$

where the prime means that only distinct eigenvalues count (coincidences occur only for borderline t). One can check that the set $\{x_j\}_{j\in I_j^\mathfrak{k}}$ is invariant under the shifted action of Weyl group $\sigma\colon \lambda \mapsto \sigma(\lambda+\rho)-\rho$.

Put $\mathrm{Tr}_q(X) = \mathrm{Tr}(\pi(q^{2h_\rho})X)$ for a matrix X with arbitrary entries. Then the elements $\tau^m = \mathrm{Tr}_q(\mathcal{Q}^m)$, $m \in I$, generate the center of $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$. Note that τ^m are not independent, as the rank of G is two.

Let χ_λ denote the central character of $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ returning $\tau^m v_\lambda = \chi_\lambda(\tau^m) v_\lambda$,

$$\chi_\lambda(\tau^m) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{7} x_{\nu_i}^m \prod_{\alpha\in \mathrm{R}_+} \frac{q^{(\lambda+\rho+\nu_i,\alpha)} - q^{-(\lambda+\rho+\nu_i,\alpha)}}{q^{(\lambda+\rho,\alpha)} - q^{-(\lambda+\rho,\alpha)}}. \tag{4.10}$$

It is invariant under the shifted action of the Weyl group W on $\mathfrak{h}^*$.

Theorem 4.1. *The image of $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ in $\mathrm{End}(M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k})$ is an equivariant quantization of the polynomial algebra $\mathbb{C}[O_t]$. It is the quotient of $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ by the ideal generated by the entries of the*

minimal polynomial over the kernel of χ_λ. The algebra $\mathbb{C}_q[O_t]$ depends only on the W-orbit of the point $t \in T$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [11]. Denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the quotient of $\mathbb{C}_q[G]$ by the ideal generated by $\ker \chi_\lambda$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the extension of $\mathrm{End}(M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}})$ over the Laurent series. Let $U_\hbar(\mathfrak{g})$ be the $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-extension of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ completed in $\hbar$-adic topology. The map $\mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is $U_\hbar(\mathfrak{g})$-equivariant. The algebra $\mathcal{S}$ is a direct sum of $U_\hbar(\mathfrak{g})$-modules that are $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-finite (as embedded in the locally finite part of $\mathrm{End}(M_\lambda)$). Since $\mathcal{T}$ has no $\hbar$-torsion, the image of $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{T}$ is $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-free. The relations (4.9) and (4.10) go over to the relations of $N(O_t)$, hence they generate the kernel of the map $\mathbb{C}_q[O_t] \to \mathcal{T}$, cf. [11] for details. This kernel is invariant under the shifted action of W on the weight λ, therefore, $\mathbb{C}_q[O_t]$ depends on the class of t. □

The key fact the proof based upon is semisimplicity of $\mathcal{Q}$. To this end, it is sufficient to show that highest weight submodules exhaust all of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$. We solve a stronger problem: we establish exact criteria when $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ splits into a direct sum of highest weight modules. The rest of the paper is devoted to this analysis.

5 Generalized parabolic Verma modules

Fix a weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and consider the Verma module M_λ. Let ${}^*M_\lambda$ denote the Verma module of lowest weight $-\lambda$. There is a unique, up to a scalar multiple, $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-invariant form $M_\lambda \otimes {}^*M_\lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ (equivalent to the contravariant Shapovalov on M_λ), which is non-degenerate if and only if M_λ is irreducible. As that is the case for generic weight, [12], there is a unique lift $\hat{\mathcal{F}} \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}_+) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ of the inverse form, where the Borel subalgebra is extended over the ring of fractions of $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$. The matrix $\hat{F} = (\pi \otimes \mathrm{id})(\hat{\mathcal{F}}) \in \mathrm{End}(V) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ is expressed through a matrix $F \in \mathrm{End}(V) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ whose entries f_{ij} are presented in Section A.2.

Put $\rho_i = (\rho, \nu_i)$, $\tilde{\rho}_i = \rho_i + \frac{1}{2}||\nu_i||^2$, $i \in I$, and define

$$\eta_{ij} = h_{\nu_i} - h_{\nu_j} + \rho_i - \rho_j - \frac{||\nu_i - \nu_j||^2}{2}, \quad A_i^j = \frac{q - q^{-1}}{1 - q^{2\eta_{ij}}}, \quad i < j.$$

For an ascending sequence of integers $m_1, \dots, m_k, j$, put $f_{m_1,\dots,m_k} = f_{m_1,m_2} \dots f_{m_{k-1},m_k}$ and $A^j_{m_1,\dots,m_k} = A^j_{m_1} \dots A^j_{m_k}$. Then

$$\hat{f}_{ij} = \sum_{i<\vec{m}<j} f_{i,\vec{m},j} A^j_{i,\vec{m}} q^{\eta_{ij} - \tilde{\rho}_i + \tilde{\rho}_j}. \tag{5.11}$$

where the summation is taken over all sequences $\vec{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ such that $i < m_1$, $m_k < j$, including $\vec{m} = \varnothing$. Finally, $\hat{f}_{ii} = 1$ for all i and $\hat{f}_{ij} = 0$ for $i > j$.

We regard $U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ as the algebra of trigonometric polynomials on $\mathfrak{h}^*$. The linear isomorphism $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-) \simeq U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{h})$ identifies elements of $U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-)$ with functions $\mathfrak{h}^* \to U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$.

The singular vector $v_{\lambda-\alpha} \in M_\lambda$ can be constructed as follows. It is known to be unique, up to a scalar factor (follows from the basics properties of reduction algebras). Therefore it is proportional to $\hat{f}_{ij}v_\lambda = \hat{f}_{ij}(\lambda)v_\lambda$ with $(i,j) \in P(\alpha)$, upon an appropriate regularization of $\hat{f}_{ij}(\lambda)$ if needed.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that $t \in T^\mathfrak{k}$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\ln t_q \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is fixed as in Section 4. For all $\alpha \in \Pi_\mathfrak{k}$ choose a pair $(i,j) \in P(\alpha)$. Then $\hat{f}_{ij}(\lambda) \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ is a deformation of a classical root vector, $f_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_-$.*

Proof. The proof is based on the fact that in any presentation of α as a sum of positive roots the summands do not belong to $R^+_\mathfrak{k}$, see e.g. [13], Lemma 2.2. □

Corollary 5.2. *The $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-extension of $M^\mathfrak{k}_\lambda$ is $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$-free.*

Proof. The proof is similar to [5], Proposition 6.2. □

5.1 Standard filtration of $V \otimes M_\lambda$

Define $\mathcal{V}_j \subset V \otimes M_\lambda$, $j \in I$, to be the submodule generated by $\{w_i \otimes v_\lambda\}_{i=1}^j$. They form an ascending filtration $\mathcal{V}_\bullet$ of $V \otimes M_\lambda$, which we call standard. Its graded module $\mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}_\bullet$ is the direct sum $\oplus_{i=1}^j \mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}_j$, where $\mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}_j = \mathcal{V}_j/\mathcal{V}_{j-1}$ is isomorphic to $M_{\lambda+\nu_j}$ for all λ (the proof is similar to [14] for classical $U(\mathfrak{g})$). It is generated by the image w^j_λ of $w_j \otimes v_\lambda$ in $\mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}_j$.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose $(i,j) \in P(\beta)$, and ψ is a Chevalley monomial of weight $-\beta$. If $\psi \not\simeq \psi^{ij}$, then $w_i \otimes \psi v_\lambda \in \mathcal{V}_{j-1}$. Otherwise,*

$$w_i \otimes \psi^{ij} v_\lambda \;\simeq\; w_j \otimes v_\lambda \mod \mathcal{V}_{j-1}. \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to [13], Proposition 3.5. □

Assuming $\lambda \in \Theta^\mathfrak{k}$ denote by $\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_j$ the image of $\mathcal{V}_j$ under the projection $V \otimes M_\lambda \to V \otimes M^\mathfrak{k}_\lambda$. Clearly the sequence $\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_\bullet = (\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_j)$ forms an ascending filtration of $V \otimes M^\mathfrak{k}_\lambda$. Denote by $\bar{I}^\mathfrak{k}$ the complement of $I^\mathfrak{k}$ in I. Then $j \in \bar{I}^\mathfrak{k}$ if and only if there is $i < j$ such that $\nu_i - \nu_j \in \Pi_\mathfrak{k}$.

Proposition 5.4. *The graded module $\mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_\bullet$ of the filtration $\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_\bullet$ is isomorphic to $\oplus_{j \in I^\mathfrak{k}} \mathrm{gr}\,\mathcal{V}^\mathfrak{k}_j$.*

Proof. Fix j and put and $\beta = \nu_1 - \nu_j$. The module $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is a quotient of $\mathcal{V}_j$ by the submodule $\mathcal{V}_{j-1} + (V \otimes M) \cap \mathcal{V}_j$, where $M = \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}}} M_{\lambda-\alpha}$. By Proposition 5.3, its subspace of weight $\nu_j + \lambda$ is isomorphic to the quotient of $w_1 \otimes M_\lambda[\lambda-\beta]$ by $w_1 \otimes \mathcal{N}_\beta v_\lambda + w_1 \otimes M[\lambda-\beta]$, where $\mathcal{N}_\beta \subset U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ is spanned by Chevalley monomials of weight $-\beta$ that are not proportional to ψ^{1j}. Then $M_\lambda[\lambda-\beta] = \mathcal{N}_\beta v_\lambda + M[\lambda-\beta]$ if and only if $\psi^{1j}v_\lambda \in M[\lambda-\beta] \mod \mathcal{N}_\beta v_\lambda$, which is equivalent to $j \in \bar{I}^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Otherwise $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda-\beta]$ is spanned by the image of $w_1 \otimes \psi^{1j}v_\lambda \simeq w_j \otimes v_\lambda$, the generator of $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$. This proves that $\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathcal{V}_{j-1}^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for each $j \in \bar{I}^{\mathfrak{k}}$ and $\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}/\mathcal{V}_{j-1}^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq \{0\}$ for $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$. □

Let $M_j \subset V \otimes M_\lambda$ denote the submodule of highest weight $\lambda + \nu_j$ and let u_j be its highest weight generator. Furthermore, consider $M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for $\lambda \in \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ and let $\pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}$ denote the projection $V \otimes M_\lambda \to V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Define $M_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}(M_j)^{\mathfrak{k}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \sum_{i=1}^{7} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$. The ascending sequence $\mathcal{W}_\bullet^{\mathfrak{k}} = (\mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}})$, $j = 1, \ldots, 7$, of submodules is also invariant under the action of $\mathcal{Q}$, which is semisimple on $W_7^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Semi-simplicity of $\mathcal{Q}$ is important for our studies, so the question is when $\mathcal{W}_7^{\mathfrak{k}} = V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ or, more specifically, $\mathcal{W}_7^{\mathfrak{k}} = \oplus_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$. We answer this question by comparing $\mathcal{W}_\bullet^{\mathfrak{k}}$ against $\mathcal{V}_\bullet^{\mathfrak{k}}$. First of all, observe that $\mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \subset \mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$, by Proposition 5.3.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{k}$ is Levi and fix $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:* i) $\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$, ii) $\mathcal{V}_i^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathcal{W}_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ *all* $i \leqslant j$, iii) *projection* $\wp_i^{\mathfrak{k}} \colon V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ *is an isomorphism on* $M_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ *for all* $i \leqslant j$, iv) $\mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \oplus_{i=1}^{j} M_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$.

Proof. It can be proved that, for Levi $\mathfrak{k}$, both $M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ and $\operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are parabolically induced from the same $U_q(\mathfrak{k})$-module. Hence the map $M_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is epimorphism and isomorphism simultaneously unless it is zero.

The implication ii) $\Rightarrow$ i) is trivial. With $\mathcal{W}_1^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathcal{V}_1^{\mathfrak{k}}$, assume that ii) is violated and let $k > 1$ be the smallest such that $\mathcal{W}_k^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq \mathcal{V}_k^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Comparison of weight subspaces gives $\dim \mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda+\varepsilon_j] = \dim \mathcal{W}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda+\varepsilon_j]+1$ for all $j \geqslant k$, so i) $\Rightarrow$ ii). Assuming ii) we find that all maps $M_i^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are surjective and therefore injective; hence iv). Conversely, iv) implies that all maps $\mathcal{W}_i^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are surjective. Since, $\mathcal{W}_1^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathcal{V}_1^{\mathfrak{k}}$, induction on i then proves ii). Furthermore, iv) implies that $M_i^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_i^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are isomorphisms, and then $M_i^{\mathfrak{k}} \cap \mathcal{W}_{i-1}^{\mathfrak{k}} \subset M_i \cap \mathcal{V}_{i-1}^{\mathfrak{k}} = \{0\}$, which proves iii). Finally, induction on i yields iii) $\Rightarrow$ ii). □

A direct sum decomposition $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}} = \oplus_j M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ implies that the operator $\mathcal{Q}$ is semisimple on $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$. More generally, $\mathcal{Q}$ is semisimple if $V \otimes M_\lambda = W_7^{\mathfrak{k}}$. That is the case if all maps $\wp_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \colon M_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \to \operatorname{gr}\mathcal{V}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are onto, i.e. the generators of $M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are not killed by $\wp_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$.

6 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda$

In this section, where work out exact criteria for decomposition of $\mathbb{C} \otimes M_\lambda$ into a direct sum of submodules of highest weight. To that end, we undertake a detailed study of singular vectors $\hat{u}_j = \hat{F}(w_j \otimes v_\lambda) \in \mathbb{C} \otimes M_\lambda$ as rational functions $\mathfrak{h}^* \to V \otimes U(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ upon the natural identification of M_λ with $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ as a vector space. We end up with rescaled singular vectors u_j, $j \in I$, that are regular on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ and never turn zero.

6.1 Singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$

The vectors $\hat{u}_j = \hat{F}(w_j \otimes v_\lambda)$, $j \in I$, are expanded as

$$\hat{u}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} w_i \otimes \hat{f}_{ij} v_\lambda \in V \otimes M_\lambda. \tag{6.13}$$

They are singular for all λ where defined and generate submodules $M_j \subset \mathbb{C} \otimes M_\lambda$ of highest weight $\lambda + \nu_j$. They have rational trigonometric dependence on λ and may have zeros and poles. As they matter up to scalar factors, it is convenient to pass from $\hat{u}_j$ to $\check{u}_j = \bar{A}^j_{1,\dots,j-1}(\lambda)\hat{u}_j$, which are regular in λ. Then

$$\check{u}_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} w_i \otimes \check{u}_{ij}, \quad \text{where} \quad \check{u}_{ij} = \bar{A}^j_{1,\dots,i-1}(\lambda)\check{f}_{ij} v_\lambda, \quad \check{f}_{ij} = \hat{f}_{ij}\bar{A}^j_{i,\dots,j-1} \in U_q(\mathfrak{b}_-). \tag{6.14}$$

They generate submodules $M_j \subset V \otimes M_\lambda$ if do not turn zero, otherwise they needs rescaling. That is the subject of our further study.

Remark that, for any $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module Z, a singular vector $u = \sum_{i \in I} w_i \otimes z_i \in V \otimes Z$, defines a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_+)$-equivariant map $V^* \to Z$. Since the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_+)$-module V^* is cyclicly generated by z_1, we call it generating coefficient of u.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that Z is generated by highest weight vector v_λ. Suppose that $\check{f}_{mj} v_\lambda = 0$ for $m < j$. Then $\check{f}_{ij} v_\lambda = 0$ for all $i \leqslant m$.*

Proof. Recall that for all $k \geqslant m$ and $\mu = \nu_k - \nu_{k+1}$, $e_\mu \check{f}_{kj} = \check{f}_{k+1,j}\bar{A}^j_k \mod U_q(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_+$, cf. [15]. Then $\check{f}_{mj} v_\lambda = 0$ implies $\bar{A}^j_{m,\dots,k-1}(\lambda)\check{f}_{kj} v_\lambda = 0$ for all $k \geqslant m+1$. If follows from (5.11) that

$$\check{f}_{m-1,j} v_\lambda = a_m(\lambda) f_{m-1,m}\check{f}_{mj} v_\lambda + \sum_{k=m+1}^{j} a_k(\lambda) f_{m-1,k}\big(\bar{A}^j_{m,\dots k-1}(\lambda)\check{f}_{kj}\big) v_\lambda,$$

where $a_i(\lambda)$ are non-vanishing numerical factors. This implies $\check{f}_{m-1,j} v_\lambda = 0$. Induction on m proves the statement for all $i \leqslant m$. $\square$

Corollary 6.2. *The vector $\check{u}_j \in V \otimes Z_\lambda$ turns zero i) only if $\bar{A}^j_m(\lambda) = 0$, ii) if only if $\check{f}_{mj} v_\lambda = 0$, for some $m < j$.*

Proof. "Only if" in both statements follow from the equalities $\check{u}_{jj} = \bar{A}^j_{1,\dots,j-1} v_\lambda$ and, respectively, $\check{u}_{1j} = \check{f}_{1j} v_\lambda$. "If" is due to Lemma 6.1. □

Remark 6.3. *Suppose that Z is a family of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules of highest weight λ ranging in an algebraic set $\Theta \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then Lemma 6.1 admits an obvious modification if one replaces equality to zero with divisibility by some $\phi \in \mathbb{C}_q[\Theta]$. Assuming it indecomposable, Corollary 6.2 can be appropriately reworded if $\mathbb{C}_q[\Theta]$ is a unique factorization domain and Z has no zero divisors. In what follows, we apply this modification to $\Theta = \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ and $Z = M^{\mathfrak{k}}_\lambda$.*

In the next statement we essentially assume that $\mathfrak{k} \neq \mathfrak{h}$.

Proposition 6.4. *The submodule $M^{\mathfrak{k}}_j \subset V \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_\lambda$ vanishes for all $j \in \bar{I}^{\mathfrak{k}}$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to consider the case $\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}} = \{\mu\}$. Choose $\lambda \in \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ so that $\check{u}_j \neq 0$. By Proposition 6.8 below, such weights are dense in $\Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Let $i \in I$ be such that $\nu_i - \nu_j = \mu$. As $\bar{A}^j_i(\lambda) = 0$, for all $k \leqslant i$ one has

$$\check{f}_{kj} v_\lambda \simeq \sum_{k < \vec{m} < i} f_{k,\vec{m},i} \bar{A}^j_{k,\vec{m},i}(\lambda) \check{f}_{ij} v_\lambda \in M_{\lambda-\mu} \subset M_\lambda.$$

Therefore $\check{u}_j$ is in the submodule $V \otimes M_{\lambda-\mu}$ and so does u_j for all $\lambda \in \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$. □

6.2 Projection to $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{V}_\bullet$

It follows from Proposition 5.3 that the image of $\hat{u}_j$ in $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{V}_\bullet$ lies in $\operatorname{gr} \mathcal{V}_j$, and thus $\hat{u}_j = \hat{D}_j w^j_\lambda$ mod $\mathcal{V}_{j-1}$ with some $\hat{D}_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Obviously $\hat{D}_1 = 1$. For higher j calculation gives

$$\hat{D}_2 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{12}]_q}{[\eta_{12}]_q}, \quad \hat{D}_3 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{13}]_q}{[\eta_{13}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{23}]_q}{[\eta_{23}]_q}, \quad \hat{D}_4 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{14}]_q}{[\eta_{14}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{24}]_q}{[\eta_{24}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{34}]_q}{[\eta_{34}]_q}, \quad \hat{D}_5 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{15}]_q}{[\eta_{15}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{25}]_q}{[\eta_{25}]_q}\frac{[\frac{\xi_{35}}{2}]_q}{[\frac{\eta_{35}}{2}]_q},$$

$$\hat{D}_6 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{16}]_q}{[\eta_{16}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{36}]_q}{[\eta_{36}]_q}\frac{[\frac{\xi_{26}}{2}]_q}{[\frac{\eta_{26}}{2}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{56}]_q}{[\eta_{56}]_q}, \quad \hat{D}_7 \simeq \frac{[\xi_{27}]_q}{[\eta_{27}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{37}]_q}{[\eta_{37}]_q}\frac{[\frac{\xi_{17}}{2}]_q}{[\frac{\eta_{17}}{2}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{57}]_q}{[\eta_{57}]_q}\frac{[\xi_{67}]_q}{[\eta_{67}]_q},$$

where the quantities

$$\xi_{ij} = h_i - h_j + \rho_i - \rho_j + \frac{1}{2}(||\nu_i||^2 - ||\nu_j||^2) \in \mathfrak{h} + \mathbb{C}$$

are related to eigenvalues of the operator $\mathcal{Q}$ by $q^{2\xi_{ij}} = x_i \bar{x}_j$. For reader's convenience, ξ_{ij} are given in Section A.1.

Let $\Theta_j \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, $j > 4$, denote the set of weights such that $q^{2\eta_{4j}(\lambda)} = -q^2$.

Lemma 6.5. *The module M_j is not contained in $\mathcal{V}_{j-1}$ for a dense open subset $\Theta_j^\circ \subset \Theta_j$.*

Proof. Observe that $q^{2\xi_{4j}} = -q^2 \neq 1$ and $q^{2\xi_{j'j}} = q^8 \neq 1$. For all other $i < j$, the functions $q^{2\xi_{ij}}$ are not constant on Θ_j. Therefore all $q^{2\xi_{ij}}$ with $i < j$ are distinct from 1, off an algebraic subset in Θ_j. For such weights, M_j cannon be in $\mathcal{V}_j$, since the eigenvalue x_j is distinct from the $\mathcal{Q}$-eigenvalues $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{j-1}$ on $\mathcal{V}_{j-1}$. □

Corollary 6.6. *For all $j > 4$, $\check{f}_{1j}$ identically vanishes on Θ_j.*

Proof. The product $\check{D}_j = \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \bar{A}_k^j \hat{D}_j$ is polynomial in $q^{\pm h_\mu}$ and turns zero on Θ_j for $j > 4$ thanks to the factor $\bar{A}_{j'}^j$ and the equality $\frac{\eta_{j'j}}{2} = \eta_{4j} - 1$. The tensor $\check{u}_j \in V \otimes M_\lambda$ is projected to $\check{C}(\lambda) w_\lambda^j = 0 \mod \mathcal{V}_{j-1}$. That is possible only in the following two cases: either $\check{u}_j$ turns zero or $M_j \subset \mathcal{V}_{j-1}$. By Lemma 6.5, $\check{u}_j(\lambda) = 0$ on Θ_j° and hence on Θ_j. This yields $\check{u}_{1j} = \check{f}_{1j} v_\lambda = 0$ on Θ_j for the generating coefficient. □

6.3 Regularization of singular vectors in $V \otimes M_\lambda$

In this section, we evaluate a scalar function $\delta_j \sqsubset \check{u}_j$ and show that renormalized singular vectors $\delta_j^{-1} \check{u}_j$ do not turn zero at all λ.

Denote by J the two-sided ideal in $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ generated by the relation $f_\alpha f_\beta = \bar{q}^3 f_\beta f_\alpha$. The non-zero elements f_{ij} modulo J read

$$f_{12} = f_\alpha, \quad f_{23} = [3]_q f_\beta, \quad f_{34} = f_\alpha, \quad f_{45} = f_\alpha, \quad f_{56} = [3]_q f_\beta, \quad f_{67} = f_\alpha,$$
$$f_{24} = (\bar{q}^3 - q^3) f_\beta f_\alpha, \quad f_{35} = \frac{\bar{q}^2 - 1}{[2]_q} f_\alpha^2, \quad f_{57} = (\bar{q}^3 - q^3) f_\beta f_\alpha,$$
$$f_{25} = \frac{(\bar{q}^3 - q)(\bar{q}^3 - q^3)}{[2]_q^2} f_\beta f_\alpha^2.$$

Introduce $\check{g}_{ij}$ as polynomials in $y_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, y_7^{\pm 1}$ with coefficients in $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_-)$ by similar formulas as $\check{f}_{ij}$ with all $\bar{A}_k^j$ in (5.11) and (6.14) replaced by $\bar{A}_k = \frac{1 - y_k}{q - \bar{q}}$.

Lemma 6.7. *One has $\check{g}_{35} \simeq f_\alpha^2 \frac{\bar{q} y_4 + q}{q + \bar{q}}$. Furthermore, $\check{g}_{25} \simeq [3]_q f_\beta f_\alpha^2 \frac{\bar{q} y_4 + q}{q + \bar{q}} \mod J$.*

Proof. All calculations will be done modulo J. First of all,

$$\check{g}_{35} \simeq f_{35} \bar{A}_4 + f_{34} f_{45} = f_\alpha^2 \Big(\frac{\bar{q}^2 - 1}{[2]_q} \frac{y_4 - 1}{\bar{q} - q} + 1 \Big) = f_\alpha^2 \frac{\bar{q} y_4 + q}{q + \bar{q}}.$$

Substitute $f_{ij} \mod J$ into $\check{g}_{25} \simeq f_{25} \bar{A}_3 \bar{A}_4 + f_{23} f_{35} \bar{A}_4 + f_{24} f_{45} \bar{A}_3 + f_{23} f_{34} f_{45}$ and get

$$\check{g}_{25} \simeq f_\beta f_\alpha^2 \Big(\frac{(\bar{q}^3 - q)(\bar{q}^3 - q^3)}{[2]_q^2} \bar{A}_3 \bar{A}_4 + [3]_q \frac{\bar{q}^2 - 1}{[2]_q} \bar{A}_4 + (\bar{q}^3 - q^3) \bar{A}_3 + [3]_q \Big).$$

Computation of the coefficient in the brackets completes the proof. □

Set $\delta_j = \frac{q^{\eta_{4j}-1}+q^{-\eta_{4j}+1}}{q+\bar{q}} = \frac{q^{\frac{\eta_{j'j}}{2}}+q^{-\frac{\eta_{j'j}}{2}}}{q+\bar{q}}$ for $5 \leqslant j$ and $\delta_j = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Corollary 6.6 assures that $\check{f}_{1j}/\delta_j$ is a polynomial in $q^{\pm h_\mu}$ via identification $y_i = q^{2\eta_{ij}}$, $i < j$.

Proposition 6.8. *For all $j > 1$, the vectors $\check{f}_{1j}/\delta_j$ do not turn zero on $\mathfrak{h}^*$.*

Proof. Again, all calculations are done modulo J. The statement is trivial for $j = 2$. For $j = 3$, it follows from the factorization $\check{f}_{13} = f_{12}f_{23}$. We also have

$$\check{f}_{14} \simeq f_{12}\check{f}_{24} \simeq f_\alpha([3]_q f_\beta f_\alpha + (\bar{q}^3 - q^3) f_\beta f_\alpha \bar{A}_3^4) = [3]_q f_\alpha f_\beta f_\alpha q^{\eta_{35}} \neq 0,$$

which proves the case $j = 4$.

For each $j \geqslant 5$ and all $i < j$ we assign $y_i = q^{2\eta_{ij}}$ and use Lemma 6.7: the key point is that δ_j cancels the factor $\bar{q}y_4 + q$ in all cases. Modulo J, we have $\check{f}_{15}(\lambda) \simeq f_{12}\check{g}_{25}$ and $\check{f}_{16}(\lambda) \simeq f_{12}\check{g}_{25}f_{56}$. This implies the statement for $j = 5, 6$. Finally,

$$\check{f}_{17}(\lambda) \simeq f_{12}\check{g}_{27} \simeq f_{12}(\check{g}_{26}f_{67} + \check{g}_{25}f_{57}\bar{A}_6) \simeq f_{12}(\check{g}_{25}f_{56}f_{67} + \check{g}_{25}f_{57}\bar{A}_6) = f_\alpha \check{g}_{25} f_\beta f_\alpha [3]_q y_6,$$

which proves it for $j = 7$. □

6.4 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda$

Denote by u_j the singular vectors $\check{u}_j/\delta_j(\lambda)$ for all $j \in I$. Then $u_j = D_j w_j^\lambda \mod \mathcal{V}_{j-1}$ with $D_j \simeq \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \phi_{ij}$, where $\phi_{ij} = [\xi_{ij}]_q$ if $i \neq j'$ and $\phi_{j'j} = [\frac{\xi_{j'j}}{2}]_q$.

Lemma 6.9. *The submodule M_j is contained in M_i with $i < j$ if and only if $\phi_{ij}(\lambda) = 0$.*

Proof. The eigenvalues $q^{2(\rho,\nu_1)}x_j$ of the operator $q^{2(\rho,\nu_1)}\mathcal{Q}$ on the submodules M_j are

$$q^{2(\lambda,2\alpha+\beta)+10},\ q^{2(\lambda,\alpha+\beta)+8},\ q^{2(\lambda,\beta)+2},\ q^{-2},\ q^{-2(\lambda,\beta)-2},\ q^{-2(\lambda,\alpha+\beta)-8},\ q^{-(\lambda,2\alpha+\beta)-10}, \qquad (6.15)$$

counting from the left. If $\phi_{ij}(\lambda)$ and hence $D_j(\lambda)$ turns zero, then $x_j = x_i$ and $M_j \subset \mathcal{W}_{j-1}$, by Proposition 5.5. Suppose that x_j is distinct from x_k if $k < j$ and $k \neq i$. As follows from (6.15) such weights are dense in the set of solution to $\phi_{ij}(\lambda) = 0$. Then M_j can lie only in M_i and hence it does for all such weights.

Conversely, let λ be so that $M_j \subset M_i$. Then $[\xi_{ij}]_q = 0$ and hence $\phi_{ij}(\lambda) = 0$ if $i \neq j'$. If $i = j'$, we can assume that $M_j \not\subset M_i$ for $i \neq j'$ since λ is in the closure of such weights, cf. (6.15). Proposition 5.5 then suggests that $D_j(\lambda) = 0$, and the only vanishing factor can be $\phi_{j'j}$. Then it is true for all λ. □

As an application of the obtained results, we describe direct sum decomposition of the module $V \otimes M_\lambda$. This corresponds to maximal conjugacy classes, with $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{h}$. Fix $t = \mathrm{diag}(t_i) \in T$ and choose λ to fulfill the condition $tq^{-2h_\rho} = q^{2h_\lambda}$. This fixes the relation between the entries of t and the $\mathcal{Q}$-eigenvalues as $t_i = q^{2(\lambda+\rho,\nu_i)} = x_i q^{2\delta_{i4}-2\rho_1}$.

Proposition 6.10. *Suppose that $t \in T^\mathfrak{h}$ and parameterize it as in (2.1) and (2.2). Then $V \otimes M_\lambda = \oplus_{i=1}^7 M_i$ if and only if $q^{-2} \neq x, y, xy$ for regular t and $q^{-4} \neq x^2$ for borderline t.*

Proof. The sum $\sum_{i=1}^7 M_i$ exhausts all of $V \otimes M_\lambda$ if and only if it is direct, by Proposition 5.5 or, equivalently, if $D^\mathfrak{h} = \prod_{i=1}^7 D_i$ is not zero. Explicitly,

$$D^\mathfrak{h} \simeq \prod_{\substack{i<j \\ i\neq j',4}} (x_i - x_j) \prod_{i=1}^3 (x_i - q^{2\rho_1}) \simeq \prod_{\substack{i<j \\ i\neq j' \\ i,j\neq 4}} (t_i - t_j) \prod_{i=1}^3 (t_i - q^{-2}) \prod_{i=1}^3 (t_i - 1) \simeq \prod_{i=1}^3 (t_i - q^{-2})$$

for $t \in T^\mathfrak{h}$. This implies the stated conditions on q guaranteeing $D^\mathfrak{h} \neq 0$ (mind that q is not a root of unity). □

Next we essentially assume that $\mathfrak{k} \neq \mathfrak{h}$ and put $\phi_j^\mathfrak{k} = \prod_{i \in \bar{I}_j^\mathfrak{k}} \phi_{ij}$, $j \in I^\mathfrak{k}$.

Lemma 6.11. *For every $j \in I^\mathfrak{k}$, the vector $\pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j)$ vanishes once $\phi_j^\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) = 0$. If $\mathfrak{k}$ is of type $\mathfrak{k}_s$ or $\mathfrak{k}_l$, then $\pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j)$ is divisible by $\phi_j^\mathfrak{k}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.9, $u_j \in M_i$ once $\phi_j^\mathfrak{k}(\lambda) = 0$. On the other hand, $\pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j) = 0$ if $\lambda \in \Theta^\mathfrak{k}$, by Proposition 6.4. Therefore $\pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j)$ vanishes in $V \otimes M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$. If the semisimple part of $\mathfrak{k}$ has rank 1, trigonometric polynomials on $\Theta^\mathfrak{k}$ form a principal ideal domain as $\dim \Theta^\mathfrak{k} = 1$. Therefore $\pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j)$ is divisible by $\phi_j^\mathfrak{k}(\lambda)$.

□

7 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_s}$

Throughout this section $\nu \in \mathrm{R}^+$ is a short root and $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_s$ is the reductive subalgebra of maximal rank with the root system $\{\pm\nu\}$. We aim to prove that the vectors $u_j^\mathfrak{k} = \frac{1}{\phi_j^\mathfrak{k}(\lambda)} \pi_V^\mathfrak{k}(u_j) \in V \otimes M_\lambda^\mathfrak{k}$ are regular functions of λ and do not vanish at all weights. Their projections to $\mathrm{gr}\, \mathcal{V}_\bullet^\mathfrak{k}$ are equal to $D_j^\mathfrak{k} w_j^\lambda$ with $D_j^\mathfrak{k} \simeq \prod_{i \in I_j^\mathfrak{k}} \phi_{ij}$.

7.1 Regularization of singular vectors in $V \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}$

Assuming $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$, denote by $c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$ the coefficient in the expansion $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_j \simeq w_j \otimes c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j v_\lambda + \ldots$, where the suppressed terms belong to $\sum_{i<j} w_i \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}$. It is equal to $\frac{\prod_{i<j}[\eta_{ij}]}{d_j d^{\mathfrak{k}}_j}$ up to a non-vanishing factor.

$\nu=\alpha$, $(\lambda,\alpha)=0$, $\theta=(\lambda,\beta)$			
$j \in I_{\mathfrak{k}}$	$\phi^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$D^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$
1	1	1	1
3	$[\theta{+}3]_q$	$[\theta{+}3]_q$	$[\theta]_q$
6	$[\theta{+}4]_q[\theta{+}3]_q[\theta{+}3]_q$	$[2\theta{+}9]_q[\theta{+}5]_q$	$[\theta{+}2]_q[2\theta{+}6]_q$
$\nu=\alpha+\beta$, $q^{2(\lambda,\nu)+6}=1$, $\theta=(\lambda,\alpha)$			
$j \in I_{\mathfrak{k}}$	$\phi^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$D^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$
1	1	1	1
2	1	$[\theta{+}1]_q$	$[\theta]_q$
5	$[\theta{+}1]_q[\theta]_q$	$[2\theta{+}3]_q[\theta{+}2]_q$	$[\theta{-}1]_q[2\theta]_q$
$\nu=2\alpha+\beta$, $q^{2(\lambda,\nu)+8}=1$, $\theta=(\lambda,\alpha)$			
$j \in I_{\mathfrak{k}}$	$\phi^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$D^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$	$c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$
1	1	1	1
2	1	$[\theta{+}1]_q$	$[\theta]_q$
3	1	$[\theta]_q[2\theta{+}1]_q$	$[\theta{+}1]_q[2\theta{+}4]_q$

Table 1: Type $\mathfrak{k} \simeq \mathfrak{k}_s$

Proposition 7.1. *The vectors $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$ do not vanish at all weights.*

Proof. We parameterize $\Theta^{\mathfrak{k}} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ with the complex variable θ as in Table 1.

The case $\nu = \alpha$ follows from the fact that the null sets of $D^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$ and $c^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$ do not intersect, cf. Table 1.

In the case of $\nu = \alpha + \beta$, the statement is trivial for $j = 1$ and immediate for $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_2 \simeq -q^{-1} w_1 \otimes f_\alpha v_\lambda + w_2 \otimes [\theta]_q v_\lambda$. Let us prove it for $j = 5$. Choose a basis $f_\beta f_\alpha^3 v_\lambda$, $f_\alpha f_\beta f_\alpha^2 v_\lambda$, $f_\alpha^2 f_\beta f_\alpha v_\lambda$ in the weight subspace $M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}[\lambda - \beta - 3\alpha]$. The coefficient in $\check{f}_{15}/(\delta_5 \phi^{\mathfrak{k}}_5)$ corresponding to $f_\beta f_\alpha^3$ is equal to $[\eta_{25}]_q = [\theta + 1]_q$, up to an invertible multiplier. Hence $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_5$ does not turn zero unless $[\theta + 1]_q = 0$. However, $D^{\mathfrak{k}}_5 \neq 0$ at such λ. Therefore $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_5 \neq 0$ at all weights from $\Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$.

Finally, consider the case $\nu = 2\alpha + \beta$. The projection $M_\lambda \to M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is an isomorphism on subspaces of weights $\lambda - \mu$ with $\mu < 2\alpha + \beta$. So are the weights of the generating coefficients in $u_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}(u_j)$. They do not turn zero as $u_j \neq 0$ at all weights. This completes the proof. □

7.2 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_s}$

Fix $t \in T^\nu$ and let $\mathfrak{k}$ be the stabilizer of t. Choose $\lambda \in \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ from the equality $q^{2\lambda+2\rho} = tq^\nu$. We use $x \in \mathbb{C}^\star$, $x^2 \neq 1$, to parameterise the spectrum $\{x^{\pm 1}, 1\}$ of t as (2.3).

Proposition 7.2. *The module $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ splits into the direct sum $\oplus_{j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ if and only if $q \neq x^{\pm 1}$.*

Proof. Table 1 gives $D^{\mathfrak{k}} = \prod_{j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} D_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq (q - x)(q - x^{-1})$. The sum $\sum_{j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ exhausts all of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ if and only if $D^{\mathfrak{k}}$ does not vanish. It also implies that the eigenvalues $qx^{\pm 1}, q^2$ of $q^{10}\mathcal{Q}$ are pairwise distinct, hence the sum is direct. □

8 Module structure of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$

In this section $\nu \in \mathrm{R}^+$ is one of the three long roots, and $\mathfrak{k} \simeq \mathfrak{k}_l \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is the reductive subalgebra of maximal rank with the root system $\{\pm\nu\}$. Now $\Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ the set of weights λ that satisfy the condition $q^{2(\lambda+\rho,\nu)-6} = 1$. We parameterize it with the complex variable $\theta = (\lambda, \alpha)$. There are two pairs $(l, k) \in P(\nu)$, so $\#\bar{I}_{\mathfrak{k}} = 2$ and $\#I_{\mathfrak{k}} = 5$.

8.1 Regularization of singular vectors for quasi-Levi $\mathfrak{k}$

The case of quasi-Levi $\mathfrak{k}_l$ turns out to be simpler, so we consider it first. For $\nu = 3\alpha + 2\beta$, we have $I^{\mathfrak{k}} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $q^{2(\lambda, 3\alpha+2\beta)+12} = 1$, and $\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = 1$ for all $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$. For $\nu = 3\alpha + \beta$, we have $I^{\mathfrak{k}} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6\}$, $q^{2(\lambda, 3\alpha+\beta)+6} = 1$, and $\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = 1$ for $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$ apart from $\phi_6^{\mathfrak{k}} = [3\theta]_q$, where $\theta = (\lambda, \alpha)$.

For each $\mu < \nu$, projection $M_\lambda[\lambda - \mu] \to M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda - \mu]$ is an isomorphism. Therefore $\pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}(u_j) = u_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ does not turn zero unless maybe $\nu = 3\alpha + \beta$, $j = 6$. In the latter case $\mathbb{C}_6^{\mathfrak{k}} = [3\theta - 3]_q[2\theta - 1]_q[\theta - 2]_q[2\theta]_q$ and $c_6^{\mathfrak{k}} = [2\theta + 1]_q[\theta - 1]_q[2\theta]_q[3\theta + 3]_q$, so $u_6^{\mathfrak{k}}$ may vanish only at $q^{2\theta} = \pm 1, q^2$. However, $u_{36}^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq [2\theta + 1]_q \check{f}_{36} v_\lambda$, and one can easily check that

$$\check{f}_{36} = \frac{[[f_\beta, f_\alpha]_q, f_\alpha]_{q^3}}{[2]_q^2} \bar{A}_4 \bar{A}_5 + f_\alpha [f_\alpha, f_\beta]_{q^3} \bar{A}_5 + f_\alpha^2 f_\beta \left(\frac{q + q^{-4\theta-1}}{[2]_q}\right)[3]_q \neq 0$$

at all weights. Hence $u_6^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq 0$ at all weights.

8.2 Regularization of singular vectors for Levi $\mathfrak{k}$

$j \in I_{\mathfrak{k}}$	$\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$	$\check{D}_j/(\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}\delta_j)$	$\check{c}_j/(\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}\delta_j)$	$D_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$
1	1	1	1	1
2	1	$[\theta+1]_q$	$[\theta]_q$	$[\theta+1]_q$
4	$[\theta+2]_q$	$[2\theta+6]_q[\theta+5]_q$	$\frac{[2\theta+4]_q}{[\theta+2]_q}[\theta+3]_q[\theta]_q$	$\frac{[2\theta+6]_q}{[\theta+3]_q}[\theta+5]_q$
5	$[\theta+1]_q$	$[3\theta+6]_q[2\theta+5]_q[\theta]_q$	$\frac{[3\theta+3]_q}{[\theta+1]_q}[\theta-1]_q[2\theta+4]_q[\theta]_q$	$\frac{[3\theta+6]_q}{[\theta+2]_q}[2\theta+5]_q[\theta]_q$
7	$[3\theta+6]_q[\theta+1]_q$	$[2\theta+5]_q[3\theta+9]_q[2\theta+4]_q[\theta+4]_q$	$[2\theta+3]_q\frac{[3\theta+3]_q}{[\theta+1]_q}[2\theta+4]_q[\theta+3]_q[\theta]_q$	$[2\theta+5]_q\frac{[3\theta+9]_q}{[\theta+3]_q}\frac{[2\theta+4]_q}{[\theta+2]_q}[\theta+4]_q$

Table 2: $\nu = \beta$, $(\lambda, \beta) = 0$, $(\lambda, \alpha) = \theta$

From this table we conclude that $u_j/\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ may be divisible by following factors:

1. $[\theta+3]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_2^4$, for $j = 4$,
2. $[\theta+2]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_2^5$, $[\theta]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_4^5$, for $j = 5$,
3. $[2\theta+4]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_4^7$, $[\theta+3]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_5^7$, for $j = 7$.

Introduce $\psi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$ as

$$\psi_1^{\mathfrak{k}} = 1, \quad \psi_2^{\mathfrak{k}} = 1, \quad \psi_4^{\mathfrak{k}} = [\theta+3]_q, \quad \psi_5^{\mathfrak{k}} = [\theta+2]_q, \quad \psi_7^{\mathfrak{k}} = [\theta+2]_q[\theta+3]_q.$$

Proposition 8.1. *For all $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$, the singular vector $\pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}(u_j)/\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is divisible by $\psi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$, and $u_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \pi_V^{\mathfrak{k}}(u_4)/(\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}\psi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}) \neq 0$ at all λ.*

Proof. There is nothing to prove for $j = 1, 2$, so we assume $j = 4, 5, 7$. We should only check divisibility, because non-zero property then follows from factorization of $\check{D}_j$. One can check that

$$\check{f}_{14}v_\lambda \simeq (f_{13}f_\alpha - f_\alpha f_\beta f_\alpha \bar{q}^3)[\theta+3]_q[\theta+2]_q, \tag{8.16}$$

$$\check{f}_{25}v_\lambda \simeq \Big(f_{24}f_\alpha\bar{q}^2\frac{1-q^{2\theta-2}}{q-q^{-1}} + f_\beta f_\alpha^2\frac{1}{[2]}(\bar{q}[3]_q + \frac{1-q^{2\theta}}{q-q^{-1}})\Big)\delta_5[\theta+2]_q v_\lambda, \tag{8.17}$$

$$\check{f}_{47}v_\lambda \simeq (f_{46}f_\alpha q^3 - f_\alpha f_\beta f_\alpha)[\theta+3]_q[\theta+2]_q, \tag{8.18}$$

in the module $M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Now the proof for $j = 4$ readily follows from (8.16).

Furthermore, (8.17) implies that $\check{f}_{15}$ is not divisible by $[\theta]_q$ and divisible by $[\theta+2]_q$, by Lemma 6.1. Therefore, $\check{f}_{15}/(\delta_5[\theta+1]_q[\theta+2]_q)$ is regular and never turns zero. This proves the case $j = 5$.

Equality (8.18) implies that $\check{f}_{i7}$ are divisible by $[\theta+2]_q[\theta+3]_q$ for all $i \leqslant 4$. Since $[\theta+2]_q \sqsubset \bar{A}_2^7 \sqsubset \phi_7^{\mathfrak{k}}$, we have $[\theta+2]_q^2 \sqsubset \bar{A}_2^7 \check{f}_{37} v_\lambda \simeq e_\beta \check{f}_{27} v_\lambda$ and need to prove $[\theta+2]_q^2 \sqsubset \check{f}_{27}$. It is easy to check that the operator

$$M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda-3\alpha-2\beta] = \mathrm{Span}\{f_\beta f_\alpha^i f_\beta f_\alpha^{3-i} v_\lambda\}_{i=0}^2 \xrightarrow{e_\beta} \mathrm{Span}\{f_\alpha^i f_\beta f_\alpha^{3-i} v_\lambda\}_{i=0}^2 = M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}[\lambda-3\alpha-\beta]$$

is independent of λ and has zero kernel. Therefore $\check{f}_{27}$ is divisible by $[\theta+2]_q^2$ as required. □

Define $D_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ from the equality $\wp_j^{\mathfrak{k}}(u_j^{\mathfrak{k}}) = D_j^{\mathfrak{k}} w_j^\lambda$ and put $D^{\mathfrak{k}} = \prod_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} D_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$. It follows that $D_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq D_j/(\phi_j^{\mathfrak{k}}\psi_j^{\mathfrak{k}})$.

8.3 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$

Fix $t \in T^\nu$ with the stabilizer $\mathfrak{k}$ and determine $\lambda \in \Theta^{\mathfrak{k}}$ from the equality $q^{2h_\lambda+2h_\rho} = tq^{h_\nu}$. We use $x \in \mathbb{C}^\star$, $x^2, x^3 \neq 1$, to parameterise the spectrum $\{x^{\pm 2}, x^{\pm 1}, 1\}$ of t as in (2.4) and (2.5), for the regular and borderline cases. Then the spectrum of the operator $q^{2\rho_1}\mathcal{Q}$ on the module $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$ is $\{x^{\pm 2}, q^3 x^{\pm 1}, q^{-2}\}$.

Proposition 8.2. *The module $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ splits into direct sum $\oplus_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ if and only if a) $q^3 \neq x^{\pm 1}$, $\frac{q^3-x^{\pm 3}}{q-x^{\pm 1}} \neq 0$, for $\nu = \beta$, b) $q^3 \neq x^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 3}$ for $\nu \neq \beta$.*

Proof. Assuming $t \in T^\nu$, we get $D^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq (x-q^3)^2(x-\bar{q}^3)^2 \frac{x^3-q^3}{x-q}\frac{\bar{x}^3-q^3}{\bar{x}-q}$, for $\nu = \beta$ and $D^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq (x-q^3)^2(x-\bar{q}^3)^2(x^3-q^3)(\bar{x}^3-q^3)$, for $\nu \neq \beta$. The sum $\sum_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ exhausts all of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ if and only if $D^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq 0$.

Now suppose that $D^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq 0$. Then the sum $\sum_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ is direct for $\nu = \beta$ by Proposition 5.5. For $\nu \neq \beta$, that is obvious if the $\mathcal{Q}$-eigenvalues are pairwise distinct (which is violated for a finite number of q). Still it is true in all cases. We give a sketch of the proof based on character analysis. One can check that $M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ are quotients of $\tilde{M}_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$, where $\tilde{M}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = M_{\lambda+\nu_j}/M_{\lambda+\nu_j-\ell_j\nu}$ with $\ell_j = \frac{2(\nu_j,\nu)}{(\nu,\nu)}+1 \in \{1,2\}$. It is easy to see that $\sum_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} \mathrm{ch}\tilde{M}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathrm{ch}V \times \frac{e^\lambda(1-e^{-\nu})}{\prod_{\alpha\in \mathrm{R}^+}(1-e^{-\alpha})} = \mathrm{ch}(V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}})$. Now the map $\oplus_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} \tilde{M}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \to V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}_l}$ is injective because it is surjective. This also implies $\tilde{M}_j^{\mathfrak{k}} \simeq M_j^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for all $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$. □

9 Decomposition of $V \otimes M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ for pseudo-Levi $\mathfrak{k}$

Let μ and ν denote, respectively, the minimal and maximal weight in $\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}}$ and put $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{k}$ to be the reductive subalgebra of maximal rank such that $\Pi_{\mathfrak{m}} = \{\mu\}$. For $\lambda \in \Theta_{\mathfrak{m}} \subset \Theta_{\mathfrak{k}}$, the homomorphism $M_\lambda \to M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$ factors through the projection $M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{m}} \to M_\lambda^{\mathfrak{k}}$. Its restriction

$M^{\mathfrak{m}}_{\lambda}[\lambda-\xi] \to M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}[\lambda-\xi]$ is an isomorphism for $\xi < \nu$. It follows from here that the map $\sum_{\nu_i<\nu} w_i \otimes M^{\mathfrak{m}}_{\lambda}[\lambda-\nu_i] \to \sum_{\nu_i<\nu} w_i \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}[\lambda-\nu_i]$ sends non-vanishing singular vectors $u^{\mathfrak{m}}_j$ with $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}} \subset I^{\mathfrak{m}}$ over to non-zero singular vectors, $u^{\mathfrak{k}}_j \in V \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}$. One can check that $D^{\mathfrak{k}}_j(\lambda) = D^{\mathfrak{m}}_j(\lambda) \neq 0$, for all $j \in I^{\mathfrak{k}}$.

$\Pi_{\mathfrak{k}}$	t	$q^{2(\lambda,\alpha)}$	$q^{2(\lambda,\beta)}$	$I^{\mathfrak{k}}$
$\{\beta, 3\alpha+\beta\}$	$(e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}})$	$e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}q^{-2}$	1	$\{1,2,4\}$
$\{\beta, 3\alpha+\beta\}$	$(e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}})$	$e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}q^{-2}$	1	$\{1,2,4\}$
$\{\alpha, 3\alpha+2\beta\}$	$(-1,-1,1)$	1	$-q^{-6}$	$\{1,3\}$
$\{\alpha+\beta, 3\alpha+\beta\}$	$(-1,1,-1)$	-1	$-q^{-6}$	$\{1,2\}$
$\{\beta, 2\alpha+\beta\}$	$(1,-1,-1)$	$-q^{-4}$	1	$\{1,2\}$

Table 3: Pseudo-parabolic type

Proposition 9.1. *For all pseudo-Levi $\mathfrak{k} \in \mathfrak{g}$, $V \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda} = \oplus_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$.*

Proof. Since $D^{\mathfrak{k}} \neq 0$, the sum $\sum_{j\in I^{\mathfrak{k}}} M^{\mathfrak{k}}_j$ gives all $V \otimes M^{\mathfrak{k}}_{\lambda}$. It is direct as the $\mathcal{Q}$-eigenvalues are distinct. Indeed, for $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_{l,l}$ we have

$$q^{2\xi_{12}} = e^{\mp\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, \quad q^{2\xi_{14}} = e^{\pm\frac{2\pi i}{3}}q^8, \quad q^{2\xi_{24}} = e^{\mp\frac{2\pi i}{3}}q^6,$$

where the upper sign corresponds to the first row in Table 3. For the three $\mathfrak{k}_{s,l}$-points we have

$$q^{2\xi_{12}} = -q^2, \quad q^{2\xi_{12}} = -q^2, \quad q^{2\xi_{12}} = -q^{-2},$$

respectively, from the top downward. □

A Appendix

A.1 Formulas for η_{ij} and ξ_{ij}

Below we present the explicit expressions for η_{ij} and ξ_{ij}, $i \leqslant j$, arranging them into matrices.

$$(\eta_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & h_\alpha & h_{\alpha+\beta}+3 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+4 & h_{3\alpha+\beta}+3 & h_{3\alpha+2\beta}+6 & h_{4\alpha+2\beta}+6 \\ & 0 & h_\beta & h_{\alpha+\beta}+3 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+4 & h_{2\alpha+2\beta}+4 & h_{3\alpha+2\beta}+6, \\ & & 0 & h_\alpha & h_{2\alpha}-2 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+4 & h_{3\alpha+\beta}+3 \\ & & & 0 & h_\alpha & h_{\alpha+\beta}+3 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+4 \\ & & & & 0 & h_\beta & h_{\alpha+\beta}+3 \\ & & & & & 0 & h_\alpha \\ & & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(\xi_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & h_\alpha+1 & h_{\alpha+\beta}+4 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+6 & h_{3\alpha+\beta}+6 & h_{3\alpha+2\beta}+9 & h_{4\alpha+2\beta}+10 \\ & 0 & h_\beta+3 & h_{\alpha+\beta}+5 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+5 & h_{2\alpha+2\beta}+8 & h_{3\alpha+2\beta}+9, \\ & & 0 & h_\alpha+2 & h_{2\alpha}+2 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+5 & h_{3\alpha+\beta}+6 \\ & & & 0 & h_\alpha & h_{\alpha+\beta}+3 & h_{2\alpha+\beta}+4 \\ & & & & 0 & h_\beta+3 & h_{\alpha+\beta}+4 \\ & & & & & 0 & h_\alpha+1 \\ & & & & & & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

A.2 Entries of the matrix F

Here we present explicit expressions of the entries f_{ij}, $i < j$, participating in the reduced Shapovalov inverse form.

$$f_{12}{=}f_\alpha, \quad f_{23}{=}[3]_q f_\beta, \quad f_{34}{=}f_\alpha, \quad f_{45}{=}f_\alpha, \quad f_{56}{=}[3]_q f_\beta, \quad f_{67}{=}f_\alpha,$$

$$f_{13}{=}[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}, \quad f_{24}{=}[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_{q^3}, \quad f_{35}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2}{[2]_q}[f_\alpha,f_\alpha]_{q^2}, \quad f_{46}{=}[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}, \quad f_{57}{=}[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_{q^3},$$

$$f_{14}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}[f_\alpha,[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}]_{q^3}}{[2]_q}, \quad f_{25}{=}\tfrac{[f_\alpha,[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_q]_{q^3}}{[2]_q^2}, \quad f_{36}{=}\tfrac{[[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_q,f_\alpha]_{q^3}}{[2]_q^2}, \quad f_{47}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}[[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_{q^3},f_\alpha]_{q^3}}{[2]_q}$$

$$f_{15}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2[f_\alpha,[f_\alpha,[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}]_{q^3}]_q}{[2]_q^2} \quad f_{26}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^3[f_\beta,[f_\alpha,[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_q]_{q^3}]_q 6}{[2]_q^2}, \quad f_{37}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2[[[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_{q^3},f_\alpha]_{q^3},f_\alpha]_q}{[2]_q^2},$$

$$f_{16}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2}{[2]_q^2}[f_\beta,[f_\alpha,[f_\alpha,[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}]_{q^3}]_q]_{q^3}, \quad f_{27}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2}{[2]_q^2}[[[[f_\alpha,f_\beta]_{q^3},f_\alpha]_{q^3},f_\alpha]_q,f_\beta]_{q^3},$$

$$f_{17}{=}\tfrac{\bar{q}^2}{[2]_q^2}[f_\alpha,[f_\beta,[f_\alpha,[f_\alpha,[f_\beta,f_\alpha]_{q^3}]_{q^3}]_q]_{q^3}]_q.$$

References

[1] P. Ramond: *Exceptional Groups and Physics*, arXiv:hep-th/0301050.

[2] O. Hohm, H. Samtleben: *Exceptional Form of D=11 Supergravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013), 231601.

[3] J. Donin, P. Kulish, A. Mudrov: *On a universal solution to reflection equation*, Lett. Math. Phys. **63** (2003) #3, 179–194.

[4] Ashton T., Mudrov A.: *Quantization of borderline Levi conjugacy classes of orthogonal groups*. J. Math. Phys. **55** (2014), 121702.

[5] Mudrov A.:*Non-Levi closed conjugacy classes of* $SP_q(2n)$. Commun. Math. Phys. **317** (2013), 317–345.

[6] Drinfeld V.: *Quantum Groups*. In Proc. Int. Congress of Mathematicians, Berkeley 1986, Gleason, A. V. (eds) pp. 798–820, AMS, Providence (1987).

[7] Chari V., Pressley A.: *A guide to quantum groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[8] N.Y.Reshetikhin: *Quantized Universal Enveloping Algebras, The Yang-Baxter Equation and Invariant of Links* 1,11. LOMI preprints (1988).

[9] S.M. Sergeev: *Spectral decomposition of R-matrices for exceptional Lie algebras*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, **06** (1991), 923 - 927.

[10] A. Kuniba: *Quantum R-matrix for G2 and a solvable 175-vertex model*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **23** (1990), 1349–1362.

[11] Mudrov A.: *Quantum conjugacy classes of simple matrix groups*. Commun. Math. Phys. **272** (2007), 635–660.

[12] de Concini C., Kac V. G.: *Representations of quantum groups at roots of* 1*, Operator algebras, unitary representations, enveloping algebras, and invariant theory*. (Paris, 1989), Progress in Mathematics, **92**, Birkhäuser, 1990, pp.471–506.

[13] Ashton T., Mudrov A.: *Representations of Quantum Conjugacy Classes of Orthosymplectic Groups*, J. Math. Sci. 213, (2016) 637- 650

[14] Bernstein I. N., Gelfand I. M., Gelfand S. I.: *Structure of Representations that are generated by vectors of highest weight.* — Functional. Anal. Appl. **5** (1971), 1–8.

[15] Mudrov A.: *R-matrix and inverse Shapovalov form*, J. Math. Phys. **57** (2016), 051706.